



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/038,692 | 01/02/2002 | David Chou | U 013813-8 | 1969 |
| 7590 | 11/17/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| Ladas & Parry 26 West 61st Street New York, NY 10023 | | | HUYNH, THU V | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2178 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/038,692 | CHOU, DAVID |
| | Examiner Thu V Huynh | Art Unit 2178 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 01/02/2002, which has the benefit of foreign prior filed on 07/02/2001.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1-12 are elected for examination. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-13, drawn to a method for parsing of a HTML document and transcoding the HTML to another language for displaying on wireless device, classified in class 715, subclass 513.
 - II. Claims 14-25, drawn to information of user environment stored in memory from previous interaction (i.e. a personal profile), classified in class 345, subclass 745.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

4. Inventions Groups I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention Group I has separate utility such as providing a method for detecting defects in multithreaded programs, invention Group II is directed to a GUI wherein a plurality of interlinked windows are used to illustrate the detected defects. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Art Unit: 2178

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
7. During a telephone conversation with William Evans on Thursday October 28, 2004, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-13. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14-25 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. **Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al., US 2003/0101203 A1, filed 06/2001.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Chen teaches the steps of:

- retrieving a specific web page (Chen, summary, page 9, paragraph 180; page 11, paragraph 223; fig.15; Chen teaches methods analyzing web pages so that its content can be adapted to different client devices. These methods can be implemented in client devices as well as in servers that serve up web pages to client devices.

Therefor a specific web page must be retrieved either to “Object & Page Analysis Module” (fig.15, box 1520) of server system or client in order to parse, analyze and convert to be adapted to different client’ devices);

- analyzing the specific web page (Chen, page 1, paragraph 6; page 2, paragraphs 28 and 41; page 4, paragraph 96; page 7, paragraphs 136-147; parsing the web page to classified objects in the web page);

- dividing the specific web page into at least two groups (Chen, page 1, paragraph 6; page 2, paragraphs 28 and 41; page 10, paragraphs 202-204 and 210-215; page 11, paragraph 226; dividing the web page into portions or objects);
- transcoding the groups from a first language into a second language according to a predetermined parameter (Chen, page 10, paragraphs 210-220; figures 15; converting HTML portions or objects into WML according to predetermined rules); and
- outputting the transcoded groups to a mobile device (Chen, page 2, paragraph 24; page 11, paragraph 225-226; and figures 10 and 16-17).

Regarding dependent claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen teaches wherein the at least two groups are hyperlinks, text, graphics or a combination thereof (Chen, page 1, paragraph 6; page 4; paragraphs 89-96; page 10, paragraphs 210-215; parsing the web page to detecting objects such as text, images, hyperlinks).

Regarding dependent claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen teaches wherein the predetermined parameter comprises hyperlinks, text, graphics or a combination thereof or specific graphical icons (Chen, page 1, paragraph 6; page 4; paragraphs 89-96; page 10, paragraphs 210-220; re-authoring and transcoding objects according to rules for text, hyperlinks, images).

Regarding dependent claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen teaches the mobile device is a WAP mobile phone, PDA, Palm, iMode mobile phone or PHS mobile phone (Chen, page 2, paragraph 24; page 11, paragraph 225-226; and fig.16).

Regarding dependent claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen teaches the first language is HTML or cHTML and the second language is cHTML, WML, PDX or other formats (Chen, page 10, paragraph 216; conversion from HTML to WML).

Regarding dependent claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen teaches wherein the step outputting further comprises the step of displaying the transcoded groups according to predetermined rules, wherein the predetermined rules comprises the rules of re-arranging the groups on the web page (Chen, page 10, paragraphs 210-220; page 11, paragraphs 223-226; figures 10-14 and 16-17; displaying the adapted web page's content to WAP enable-device according predetermined specific rules, wherein the rules comprises the rules of re-organizing the portions or objects of the web page), first displaying the largest group or the top frame on the web page (Chen, fig.2, frame 220; page 9, paragraph 189; page 10, paragraph 210), dividing the contents of the web page into several pages for displaying (Chen, figures 10), automatically skipping to next page if no response is received from the user or skipping a specific contents of the web page (Chen, page 11, paragraph 226 and fig.17, redundant content of the web page is omitted).

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 12 is for a computer readable medium performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen teaches wherein the computer-readable medium is a recordable-type medium of a floppy disc, a hard disc drive, a RAM or CD-ROM, or a transmission-type medium of digital or analog communication link (Chen, page 11, paragraphs 231, 235-237).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., US 2003/0101203 A1, filed 06/2001, in view of Silverstein et al., US 2002/0095458 A1, priority filed 12/2000.**

Regarding dependent claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen does not explicitly disclose wherein the step retrieving further comprises the step of checking whether a re-direct directive included in the web page.

Silverstein teaches checking whether a re-direct directive included in a requested web page to retrieve cached content (Silverstein, abstract, page 3 paragraphs 29 and 31).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Silverstein's checking re-direct directive into Chen's web page to retrieve cached content. This combination would have conserved the connection of server to the Internet or other network as Silverstein suggested in page 3, paragraph 31.

13. Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., US 2003/0101203 A1, filed 06/2001, in view of Wies et al., 6,353,850, filed 08/2000.

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen does not explicitly disclose MSHTML or iHTMLDOM is used to analysis the specific web page.

Wies teaches MSHTML or iHTMLDOM is used to parse and render a web page (Wies, col.22, lines 3-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wies' MSHTML parsing into Chen's web page to provide a methodology parsing for analyzing the web page, such combination would have facilitated the analyzing step to detect objects in the web document and MSHTML is available for all application developers to use as Wies suggested in col.22, lines 10-14.

14. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., US 2003/0101203 A1, filed 06/2001, in view of Osaku et al., US 6,061,738, filed 10/1997.

Regarding dependent claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen does not explicitly disclose wherein the step retrieving further comprises the step of inputting a simplified Chinese or English URL.

Osaku teaches inputting a simplified English URL to retrieve a request web page (Osaku, abstract, col.2, lines 4-10 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Osaku's simplified English URL to Chen's teaching to request a web page from a user, since the simplified URL (address) would have easily remembered and inputted for the user to request a web page as Osaku disclosed in column 2, lines 5-6.

15. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., US 2003/0101203 A1, filed 06/2001, in view of Halahmi, US 2003/0011631 A1, filed 02/2001.**

Regarding dependent claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen does not explicitly disclose wherein the step outputting further comprises the step of detecting specification of the mobile device, wherein the specification comprises the size of the screen, the number of pixel, the number of characters to be displayed in a row, the color of the screen, or fonts of the character including traditional Chinese character, simplified Chinese character, Japanese character or Korean character.

Halami teaches detecting specification of the mobile device, wherein the specification comprises the size of the screen, the number of pixel, the number of characters to be displayed in a row, the color of the screen, or fonts of the character (Halami, page 4, paragraphs 44-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halami's detecting into Chen to determine capabilities information of the user/client device, since such information would have facilitated the format

or/and organization portions of the web page to be displayed to particular to the client device as Halami disclosed in page 5, paragraph 54.

16. **Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., US 2003/0101203 A1, filed 06/2001, in view of Szondy, US 2002/0087683 A1, filed 12/2000.**

Regarding dependent claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Chen does not explicitly disclose transmitting the contents displayed on the mobile device to other device.

Szondy teaches transmitting the contents displayed on a mobile device to other device (Szondy, page 2, paragraph 21 and 23; transmitting contents displayed on the wireless phone into a printer or email).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Szondy's teaching into Chen to transmit contents displayed on the wireless phone into a printer or email, since this combination would have shared and/or printed information on the network to other devices via email or printer.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jantgaard et al., US 6,430,624 B1, filed 10/1999, teaches different types of content are reformatted automatically for different client's devices.

Park, US 2002/0001295 A1, filed 03/2001, teaches method for providing wireless application protocol service through internet.

Art Unit: 2178

Morris, US 6,453,361 B1, filed 10/2000, teaches meta-application architecture for integrating photo-service websites.

Anderson et al., US 2003/0182449 A1, filed 05/2001, teaches simplified URL.

Smith et al., US 2004/0024848 A1, filed 04/1999, teaches method for preserving referential integrity within web sites.

Britton et al., US 2002/0059344 A1, filed 01/1999, teaches method for tailoring web page content in hypertext markup language format for display within pervasive computing devices using extensible markup language tools.

Horiguchi et al., US 2001/0015972 A1, filed 02/2001, teaches mobile communication network and communication service providing method.

Hind et al., US 6,715,129 B1, filed 10/1999, teaches document transcoding using java sever pages.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 273-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 273-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TVH
November 5, 2004

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER